

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 8 – 10, 16, 17, 19, 25, 27, 28 and 30 – 34 are pending.

Claims 16, 17, 19, 25, 27, 28 and 30 – 34 stand allowed.

Claims 8 – 10 stand rejected.

Claim 8 has been amended.

REMARKS

Allowance of Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of Claims 16, 17, 19, 25, 27, 28 and 30 – 34, as indicated on page 4 of the present Office Action.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 8 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,839,094 to French in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0045781 to Rosenheimer. Applicants respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection, however, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Claim 8 has been amended as follows:

Claim 8, as now amended, recites:

8. An interface for a monitor and a temperature probe including a temperature sensor comprising:

 a logic circuit for determining a modified resistive output for the temperature sensor and

 a means for providing the modified resistive output, wherein the means for providing the modified resistive output is compatible with the monitor such that the monitor can display a temperature that corresponds to the modified resistive output from the temperature probe, said means including a FET coupled to said logic circuit via a first

terminal and via a feedback arrangement, said means providing a FET resistance corresponding to the modified resistive output. (emphasis added)

Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification including, for example, Fig. 4 and paragraph [0017] of the application as published. No new matter has been added.

The prior art of record clearly fails to teach or suggest each of the structural features and limitations recited in amended Claim 8. As admitted by the Examiner, French does not disclose the means for providing the modified resistive output including a FET. Applicants submit that Rosenheimer also fails to teach or suggest the use of a FET providing FET resistance corresponding to the modified resistive output. A detailed reading of Rosenheimer reveals that Rosenheimer teaches the use of two or more FETs to simulate a full-bridge or a half bridge. See Paragraphs 0048-0049 (illustrating examples of the simulation of a half-bridge circuit or a full-bridge circuit by means of electronically controllable resistors in the form of field effect transistors); See also Figs. 5 – 6. Sensors are connected in a half-bridge or a full-bridge circuit “to achieve a better de-coupling of disturbance parameters, specifically improved temperature stability.” See Paragraph [0007]. Thus, Rosenheimer teaches use of two or more FETs to simulate a half-bridge or a full-bridge to achieve de-coupling of disturbance parameters, which is contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that “Rosenheimer discloses that a circuit using an FET is usable as a scaling circuit for obtaining a temperature measurement.” In contrast, the present application teaches the use

of a FET providing FET resistance corresponding to a modified resistive output, as determined by a logic circuit, to a monitor. Accordingly, Rosenheim in combination with French fails to render Claim 8 obvious.

Additionally, Rosenheim teaches that the bridges "furnish an output signal that is proportional to the product of the measured value and the supply value." See Paragraph [0007]. The present application, on the other hand, teaches the FET providing FET resistance corresponding to the modified resistive output as determined by the logic circuit. Moreover, no combination of French and Rosenheimer teach or suggest the means for providing resistive output, which means includes a FET coupled to a logic circuit via a first terminal and via a feedback arrangement. As set forth above, Rosenheimer merely teaches the use of two or more FETs connected in a half-bridge or a full bridge configuration to simulate a bridge circuit, without any feedback mechanism between the FETs and the logic circuit. In the view of the foregoing, reconsideration and removal of this 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 9 and 10 depend ultimately from patentably distinct Claim 8. At least by the virtue of their dependence, and for the reasons set forth above with regards to Claim 8, reconsideration and removal of this 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of Claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/783,491
Amdt dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office action of 12/05/2007

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all outstanding grounds raised by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit the present case is in condition for allowance, early notification of which is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any questions or outstanding matters, the Examiner is cordially invited and requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward J. Howard
Reg. No. 42,670
Howard IP Law Group
P.O. Box 226
Fort Washington, PA 19034
(215) 542-5824
(215) 542-5825 (fax)

Dated: March 5, 2008